

by



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/304,552	05/04/1999	PETER J. T. VAN RAVENSTEIN	PHN16.914	9833
26646	7590	12/15/2005	EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON ONE BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10004			VO, TUNG T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2613

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

DEC 15 2005

Technology Center 2600

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/304,552
Filing Date: May 04, 1999
Appellant(s): VAN RAVENSTEIN ET AL.

Gernard A. Messina (Reg. No. 35,952)
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 09/22/05 appealing from the Office action mailed 12/21/04.

Art Unit: 2613

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

No evidence is relied upon by the examiner in the rejection of the claims under appeal.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cotton et al. (US 4,630,110) in view of Herzog et al. (US 4,703,356).

Re claims 1-15, Cotton teaches an observations system (figs.1-3A and 3B) comprising: an observation camera (20 of fig. 1); an observation unit (27 of fig. 1) coupled to the observation camera (20 of fig. 1), and including means (22 and 25 of fig. 1) for detecting for observation purposes a relevant event occurring outside the observation system (21 of fig. 1); means (29 of fig. 1) for receiving camera signals; means (26 of fig. 1) for recording a plurality of images including an image at a time of the event (21, 42 of fig. 3A); and means (38 of fig. 3B) for displaying a sequence formed by the plurality of images upon the occurrence of the event;

wherein the plurality of images include image preceding the event, and the sequence is displayed in PIP form (38 of fig. 1).

It is noted that Cotton does not particularly teach means for repeatedly displaying the sequence formed of plurality of images.

However, Herzog teaches means (38 of fig. 1) for repeatedly displaying sequence formed of plurality of images (col. 5, lines 21-24).

Therefore, taking the combined teachings of Cotton and Herzog as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate display means (38 of fig. 1) of Herzog into the observation system of Cotton for the same purpose of repeatedly displaying the sequence formed by the plurality of images.

Doing so would provide the monitor to repeatedly display the sequence formed by the plurality of images over and over without delay at the real time as suggested by Herzog (col. 1).

2. Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tapp (US 5,657,076) in view of Roger Christopher Quirk (GB 2 203 586 A).

Re claims 1-3 and 5-6, Tapp teaches an observations system (fig. 4) comprising: an observation (20, 22, 24, 26 of fig. 4); an observation unit (36 and 70 of fig. 4) coupled to the observation camera (20, 22, 24, 26 of fig. 4), and including means (12, 14, 16, and 18 of fig. 4) for detecting for observation purposes a relevant event (col. 2, lines 45-63) occurring outside the observation system (an undesirable zones of surveillance A, B, C, and D); means (36 and 70 of fig. 4) for receiving camera signals (CAMERA SIGNAL of fig. 4); means (70 of fig. 4) for recording a plurality of images, in different formats called sub-sampled images, including an

Art Unit: 2613

image at a time of the event (56 of fig. 2, e.g. event timer generates a signal for a predetermined time interval in response of the activation signal; and means (36 of fig. 4) for displaying a sequence formed by the plurality of images upon the occurrence of the event; wherein the plurality of images include image preceding the event, and the sequence is displayed in PP form PIP, 36 of fig. 4).

It is noted that Tapp does not particularly teach means for repeatedly displaying the sequence formed of plurality of images.

However, Roger teaches means (screens) for repeatedly displaying images (front page (54)).

Therefore, taking the combined teachings of Tapp and Roger as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Roger into the system of Tapp for repeatedly displaying images. Doing so would allow the user to see the images in real time.

3. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tapp (US 5,657,076) in view of Johnson (US 6,175,373) as set forth in the previous Office Action, Paper No. 20, and the discussion follows.

Re claims 1-6, Tapp teaches a security control system comprises at least one monitor (36 of fig. 1) for observing an image captured by one or more cameras (20, 22, 24, 26 of fig.1), where the monitor display multi-video sources are provided from the cameras to the monitor (PIP of fig. 1) associated with plurality detectors (12, 14, 16, 18 of fig. 1) to trigger the cameras. Tapp further teaches the observation cameras (20, 22, 24,26) and an observation

Art Unit: 2613

monitor unit (28, 30, 32, 34, and 36 of fig. 1) with a processor as considered controller (40 of fig. 1) and monitor (36) included PIP coupled to the observation cameras, where the observation unit further comprises means (12, 14, 16, 18 of fig. 1) for detecting an observation relevant event occurring outside the observation system (surveillance cameras are at remote location and capture image of the event in a field of view outside the observation system, monitor or display station; a recording means (70 of fig. 1) for recording/storing a plurality of images including an image at a time of the event ; means (36) with PIP for displaying plurality of images simultaneously in a multiple display format such as split screen or quad screen based upon the event (col. 4, lines 15- 20). So this would fairly suggest that PIP in the display (34 of fig. 4) displays plurality of images simultaneously in a multiple display format such as split screen or quad screen based upon the event.

It is noted the PIP in the display (36 of fig. 4) of Tapp does not teach exactly “repeatedly displaying” a sequence formed by plurality of images as claimed.

However, Johnson teaches the PIP (126 of fig. 3) is repeatedly displaying a sequence formed by a plurality of images from a buffer (131 of fig. 3), where the images of the sequence are provided to the display monitor repeatedly.

Since Tapp teaches that the display (36 of fig. 1) displays the multiple display-formats for providing efficient monitoring of the zone of surveillance and suggests that the various changes, substitutions; alternations can be made for the security and surveillance system (col. 4, lines 56-59 and simultaneously receive the transmitted image from the cameras (col. 4, lines 15-20) for display; Johnson uses the PIP (126 of fig. 3) for repeatedly displaying the sequence provided from the buffer B3, wherein the sequence is formed of a plurality of frames also being repeatedly

Art Unit: 2613

displayed on the PIP (126 of fig. 3, col. 4, lines 58-67), and Johnson suggests all such extensions, modifications, rearrangements, substitutions and combinations are contemplated to be part of the disclosed system (col. 5, lines 60-64).

Therefore, taking the teachings and suggestions of Tapp and Johnson as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to incorporate the PIP (126 of fig. 3) of Johnson into the display (36 of fig. 1) of Tapp for the same purpose of repeatedly displaying the sequence formed by the plurality images.

Doing so would be desirable to have a security and surveillance system that integrates with available home equipment such as a television to provide low cost and effective surveillance monitoring of the house and grounds and eliminates or reduces disadvantages and problems associated with conventional intrusion detection devices as suggested by Tapp (col. 1).

Re claims 7-9, Tap further teaches television device (36 of fig. 1) serves to display the captured image from the camera (20-26 of fig. 1) simultaneously, this is interpreted that the camera used to provide to the television device a live image of the event (col. 4, lines 13-21); the captured image within a zone has been transmitted to the television device (36 of fig. 1) of Tap, wherein the PIP as shown in the television display (36 of fig. 1) for displaying plurality of images simultaneously in a multiple display formats such as split screen or quad screen based upon the event.

Re claims 13-14, Tapp further teaches the PP of the TV (36 of fig. 4) display the live image events recorded from the recorder (70 of fig. 4), while the live image is being displayed, the recorder (70 of fig. 4) is also recording the live image.

Re claims 10-12, and 15, the combination of Tapp and Johnson further teaches wherein the plurality images (frames) includes images preceding the event (first, second and third frames), wherein the sequence is displayed in PIP form, and where in the case of multiple events, a sequence including a latest of the multiple events is repeatedly displayed (126 of fig. 3; col. 4, lines 47-52) as suggested by Johnson. Johnson further teaches the contents of buffer B3 are repeatedly displayed to the display monitor, which is interpreted as the frame of the occurrence events is repeated displayed on the PIP (126 of fig. 1, see also col. 4, lines 57-65).

(10) Response to Argument

A. Claims 1 to 15: Cotton (US 4,630,110) and Herzog (US 4,703,356)

The appellant argued that the Cotton (US 4,630,110) and Herzog (US 4,703,356) references does not teach means for repeatedly display the sequence form of a plurality of images upon the occurrence of the event and they do not have motivation to combine to make obvious the claimed invention, pages 9-15 of the appeal brief.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the appellant. It is submitted that Cotton teaches a surveillance system having a monitor (27 of fig. 1) for displaying display the sequence form of a plurality of images upon the occurrence of the event (col. 8, lines 49-50; Note the video output of each cameras (20 of fig. 1) to be viewed at all time, either in real time, based on the reaction of a number of different possible alarm events (col. 8, lines 51-54); so this would suggest the video output from the camera to be displayed on the monitor (27 of fig. 1) repeatedly). Cotton further suggests that the monitor further have four quadrants of a screen (fig. 3A), and each of the quadrant displays an event captured from the camera (20 of fig. 1; col. 9,

Art Unit: 2613

lines 11-65) and any camera captures images to form a sequence (30 frames/s). Because the video output of the camera (20 of fig. 1) is viewed on the monitor (27 of figs. 1, 3A and 3B) all the time and in real time when the event occurs (col. 9, lines 11-65) of Cotton, that disclosure would have fairly suggested, to one ordinary skill in the art, displaying the sequence form of a plurality of images upon the occurrence of the event repeatedly.

Although Cotton does not exactly show “repeatedly displaying” the sequence form of the plurality images; however, Herzog teaches a monitor (38 of fig. 1) is displaying a motion picture of a sequence of consecutive frames in which the sequence is repeated over and over again (col. 5, lines 21-24) and suggests that the system (10 of fig. 1) and simple adaptations (38 of fig. 1) thereto are directly applicable to a wide variety of applications such as well known surveillance system, security system, and television system. Therefore, one skilled in the art to modify the teachings of the monitor (38 of fig. 1) of Herzog into the surveillance system of Cotton to be facilitated of displaying the sequence form of the plurality images repeatedly. In view of the discussion above, the Cotton and Herzog references are combinable to make obvious the claimed invention.

B. Claims 1 to 3, 5 and 6: Tapp (US 5,657,076) and Quirk (GB 2 203 586) reference.

The appellant further argued that Quirk does not teach repeatedly display the sequence of images and Tapp and Quirk reference do not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1, page 15 of the appeal brief.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. It is submitted that Tapp teaches a security control system comprises at least one monitor (36 of fig. 1) for observing an image

Art Unit: 2613

captured by one or more cameras (20, 22, 24, 26 of fig.1), where the monitor display multi-video sources are provided from the cameras to the monitor (PIP of fig. 1) associated with plurality detectors (12, 14, 16, 18 of fig. 1) to trigger the cameras. Tapp further teaches the observation cameras (20, 22, 24, 26) and an observation monitor unit (28, 30, 32, 34, and 36 of fig. 1) with a processor as considered controller (40 of fig. 1) and monitor (36) included PIP coupled to the observation cameras, where the observation unit further comprises means (12, 14, 16, 18 of fig. 1) for detecting an observation relevant event occurring outside the observation system (surveillance cameras are at remote location and capture image of the event in a field of view outside the observation system, monitor or display station; a recording means (70 of fig. 1) for recording/storing a plurality of images including an image at a time of the event ; means (36) with PIP for displaying plurality of images simultaneously in a multiple display format such as split screen or quad screen based upon the event (col. 4, lines 15- 20). So this would fairly suggest that PIP in the display (34 of fig. 4) displays plurality of images simultaneously in a multiple display format such as split screen or quad screen based upon the event.

Although, Tapp does not have exactly “repeatedly displaying” a sequence formed by plurality of images, however, Quirk discloses screens that display repeated images (see abstract) and the repeated images would form a sequence. Therefore, Tapp and Quirk are combinable to make obvious the claimed invention.

C. Claims 1-15: Tapp (US 5,637,076) and Johnson (US 6,175,373) references.

The appellant further argued that Tapp and Johnson does not disclose or suggest repeatedly display the sequence form of a plurality of images upon the occurrence of the event, pages 16-17 of the appeal briefs.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the appellant. It is submitted that Tapp teaches the television monitor and PIP (36, PIP of fig. 1) that displays multi-video sources from the cameras (20, 22, 24, 26 of fig. 1) triggered or activated by plurality detectors (12, 14, 16, 18 of fig. 1) at different locatable zones as considered an event, wherein the monitor display (36) with PIP displays a sequence formed by a plurality of images simultaneously in a multiple display format such as split screen or quad screen based upon the event (col. 4, lines 15-20); this disclosure would have fairly suggested, to one of ordinary skill in the art, displaying the transmitted images formed a sequence on the display in single image full screen (36 of fig. 1) and a sub-sampled image screen (PIP of fig. 1) repeatedly.

Johnson suggests the PIP (126 and 131 of fig. 3) is repeatedly displaying the first complete frame, second complete frame, and third complete frame from a buffer (col. 6, lines 39-63), wherein first, second, third complete frames form a sequence (30 frames/s).

Since Tapp suggests the display (36) displays in multiple display-formats for providing efficient monitoring of the zone of surveillance and the various changes, substitutions, and alternations can be made for the security and surveillance system (col. 4, lines 56-59); and Johnson uses the PIP (126 of fig. 3) for repeatedly displaying the sequence formed by a plurality of frames (col. 4, lines 58-67) and suggests all such extensions, modifications, rearrangements, substitutions and combinations are contemplated to be part of the disclosed system (col. 5, lines 60-64). Therefore, these suggestions would be motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to

Art Unit: 2613

combine the teachings and suggestions of Tapp and Johnson to make obvious the claimed subject matter.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Tung Vo


TUNG VO
PRIMARY EXAMINER


Conferees:

Chris. Kelley

MEHRDAD DASTOURI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TC 2600



Mehrdad Dastouri


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600